Message

From: Fleisig, Erica [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP

(FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=57317CE4C3234AFE86380BEAB9C70BD9-EFLEISIG]

Sent: 5/13/2020 7:34:16 PM

To: Buffo, Corey [Buffo.Corey@epa.gov]

CC: Brundage, Jennifer [brundage.jennifer@epa.gov]; Gardner, Thomas [Gardner.Thomas@epa.gov]; Ray, James

[ray.james@epa.gov]; Gravuer, Kelly [gravuer.kelly@epa.gov]; Soo-Hoo, Mimi [Soo-Hoo.Mimi@epa.gov]; Stapleton,

Gregory [stapleton.gregory@epa.gov]; Sengco, Mario [Sengco.Mario@epa.gov]; McLaughlin, Julianne

[McLaughlin.Julianne@epa.gov]; Anderson, Danielle [anderson.danielle@epa.gov]

Subject: Please use this version FW: For Corey RE: Question about state adoption of wetlands criteria

Attachments: NC_Wetland_Standards_2019_w_biological_integrity_definition.pdf;

TN_aquatic_life_narrative_biological_integrity_and_numeric_pH_criteria_wetlands_mentions.pdf; FL_62-611.pdf;

Wetlands WQS Request from SHM and BB_5 7 2020.docx

Corey,

Please use this version instead – this now incorporates info from R3 as well, so the only gap is NV and maybe some R7 states but I think this is good enough.

-Erica

From: Fleisig, Erica

Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2020 6:00 PM

To: Brundage, Jennifer <brundage.jennifer@epa.gov>; Gardner, Thomas <Gardner.Thomas@epa.gov>; Ray, James <ray.james@epa.gov>; Gravuer, Kelly <gravuer.kelly@epa.gov>; Soo-Hoo, Mimi <Soo-Hoo.Mimi@epa.gov>; Stapleton, Gregory <stapleton.gregory@epa.gov>; Sengco, Mario <Sengco.Mario@epa.gov>; McLaughlin, Julianne <mcLaughlin.Julianne@epa.gov>

Cc: Buffo, Corey <Buffo.Corey@epa.gov>; Anderson, Danielle <anderson.danielle@epa.gov>

Subject: For Corey RE: Question about state adoption of wetlands criteria

Corey,

Thanks to some quick work by the liaisons, we have responses to this wetlands request from all regions except for R3 and Terry is still checking on Nevada. Denise has been busy on a WV acid mine drainage variance comment letter, but she will try to get to this request tomorrow unless we can spare her. The full accounting is in the Word document attached, and I pasted the key takeaways below. Bottom line is that either Betsy Behl is misunderstanding what she has heard from states, or we're misunderstanding her, because we weren't able to find evidence of much of anything going on wrt wetlands criteria in recent years, and nothing new related to nutrients or biocriteria. Please let us know if this hits the mark, and if there is anything else you need for Sara. If the R3 and NV info comes in, I'll send around an updated Word doc.

-Erica

What we recommend for wetlands WQS

Text from our WQS Handbook updated criteria chapter 3:

In 2008, the EPA published a wetland-specific <u>Nutrient Criteria Technical Guidance Manual</u> to assist states and authorized tribes in developing numeric nutrient criteria for wetlands. Additionally, the EPA developed <u>narrative templates for wetlands WQS</u> including a <u>2016 frequently asked questions</u> <u>document</u> to simplify development of protective WQS for wetlands. States and authorized tribes may choose to develop different types of criteria for wetlands protection, including site-specific numeric or

narrative criteria, as long as they are scientifically defensible and protective of the designated uses, and otherwise consistent with 40 CFR 131.11 and CWA section 303(c)(2)(B).

• Wetland WQS website with all of these tools: https://www.epa.gov/wetlands/wetland-water-quality-standards

Accounting of State Wetland WQS

Summary: After searching WATA, polling the liaisons, and working with Jenn Brundage who worked on finalizing the narrative templates for wetlands mentioned above, the only states who have adopted new or revised wetlands WQS in the last 10 years appear to be Ohio and North Dakota (see more details below). Some other states have generic narrative criteria for wetlands, including statements about biological health, and many states also generally apply their general narratives and/or numeric toxics criteria to all surface waters including wetlands.

From: Fleisig, Erica

Sent: Thursday, May 7, 2020 10:35 AM

To: Brundage, Jennifer Gardner, Thomas Gardner, Thomas@epa.gov; Ray, James Gravuer, Kelly Stapleton, Mimi Stapleton, Greyory Sengco, Mario Gardner, Thomas@epa.gov; Stapleton, Mimi Stapleton, Greyory Gardner, Thomas@epa.gov; Stapleton, Greyor Stapleton, Greyor <a href="mailto:speci

Cc: Buffo, Corey <Buffo.Corey@epa.gov>; Anderson, Danielle <anderson.danielle@epa.gov>

Subject: Question about state adoption of wetlands criteria

Hi liaisons,

Do you know off the top of your heads or can you please check in with your regions about whether any states have adopted narrative wetlands criteria (for nutrients or otherwise), and whether there is anything in those narratives or wetland sections about biocriteria?

Betsy B seems to have heard that there are 6 states with narrative wetlands criteria and 10 more states looking to adopt. She mentioned nutrients specifically, but Corey would like us to check for narrative wetlands criteria more broadly and any connection to biocriteria which would be broader than nutrients.

Greg, I'm not sure if this is something that the criteria search tool could capture since I thought that was primarily numerics, but if you have an easy way of searching for these wetlands narratives please let me know.

Jenn, Sara also wants to understand what we released as guidance re: wetlands to states, so I can work with you on the side on that.

I believe we need to have this ready for Sara by next Wednesday 5/13, COB.

Thank you! -Erica

Erica Fleisig Team Leader, Regional Water Quality Standards Branch Office of Science and Technology, U.S. EPA (202) 566-1057